UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/679,069	10/05/2000	Chong-Mok Park	1317.1068	7738

21171 7590 10/28/2009

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
ATALA, JAMIE JO	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2621	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

2. On pages 10-12 applicant argues (A.) that McIlvain et al fails to disclose, suggest or teach the following limitations “using a processor to assign physically discontinuous free blocks in a disk recording area to sequential logical blocks in a circular buffer, based on the control information when a time-delayed viewing mode is selected" as recited in Claim 1.It is noted in McIlvain Column 3 Lines 40-67 disclose the use of a processor to assign physically discontinuous free blocks. Specifically, McIlvain discloses in Column 3 Lines 51-55 the following: "A next logical position does not necessarily mean the next successive logical position or any other logical position. It is whatever logical position is to be accessed next, as determined by the type of command and other control". Thereby, the free block can be discontinuous as there is not a particular block that has be processed next and thereby the examiner reads this to allow for the controller to process the blocks in a discontinuous manner since it is not required for the next block to be processed. Furthermore, applicant argues that McIlvain fails to disclose how each logical address of the circular buffer is assigned. It is noted in Column 5 Lines 53+ through Column 6 Lines 1-49 describes the processor specifically indicating the address of the logical or physical position of the storage device and thereby discloses how each address of the buffer is assigned. However, examiner notes that McIlvain does not specifically disclose the assigning of the logical or physical position of the storage device and how it corresponds to the recording area. This new limitations is taught by Barton in Column 5 Lines 34-67 which describes the assigning of

free blocks in the circular buffer wherein the actual address of each block corresponds the files being stored to the physical blocks on the recording disk.

On page 11 applicant argues McIlvain teaches a logical positioning mechanism and does not provide a host processor indicating address of the logical or physical position of the storage device; however, it is noted that the claim recites "a contoller which records a video stream in physical free blocks of the recording medium OR reads a recorded video stream recorded on the recording medium and assigns physical free blocks nearest to the recorded or reproduced physical free blocks as logical circular bugger blocks based on control information. It is disclosed by McIlvain the controller recording the video stream in physical free blocks (Column 3 Lines 53+) and therefore meets the limitation due to the claim limitation having “or” within the remaining part of the claim the references simply has to teach one or the other claimed features and as applicant agrees the first feature is clearly taught.

On page 12 applicant continues to argue that McIlvain in view of Barton fails to disclose “using a processor to assign physically discontinuous free blocks in a disk recording area to sequential logical blocks in circular buffer based on the control information when a time delayed viewing mode is selected”. It is noted in Column 5 Lines 34-67 Barton does teach the assigning of information into a circular buffer based on the next available recording address on the circular buffer. It is admitted by the applicant that Barton does teach the assigning of data to the circular buffer (page 13) but argues that the blocks may not be free blocks. It is noted by the examiner that Barton would be unable to write data to the blocks if the blocks were not free (i.e. copy

protected). Therefore, it is found that Barton does teach the deficiencies of McIlvain as discussed in pages 12-18. Although, applicants points are understood the examiner can not agree and the rejection is mainted.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMIE JO ATALA whose telephone number is (571)272-7384. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/JAMIE JO ATALA/

Examiner, Art Unit 2621